





*Am. Col. Soc.*

MARYLAND

# COLONIZATION JOURNAL.

---

CONDUCTED BY JAMES HALL, GENERAL AGENT OF THE MARYLAND STATE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

---

New Series. BALTIMORE, SEPTEMBER, 1847. Vol. 4.—No. 3.

---

“Nothing is more clearly written in the Book of Destiny, than the Emancipation of the Blacks; and it is equally certain that the two races will never live in a state of equal freedom under the same government, so insurmountable are the barriers which nature, habit and opinion have established between them.”

JEFFERSON.

---

## OUR AUTUMNAL EXPEDITION.

IN order to enable the Liberia Packet, to complete her three voyages per year, (which we promised she should do after the first,) we were obliged to anticipate our usual time of despatching our fall expedition by two months. From this cause, in addition to those usually operating, we had reason to expect but few emigrants, and up to the week previous to the sailing of the Packet, we had scarce a dozen applicants. The number however, continued rapidly to increase, and we were enabled at last to muster forty-one, besides several returning colonists. Of this number, over twenty were from the city of Baltimore, quite a new feature in the character of our emigration. The American Colonization Society, also, sent out forty, making over eighty in all. The character and general appearance of the emigrants were decidedly better than that of any expedition since the La Fayette, in 1833, and we cannot doubt, but they will exert a very important influence upon the colony.

Of the Maryland emigrants, six were set free by the Rev. Mr. Goodwin, of Charles County, who, it will be remembered, has heretofore manumitted many for the same purpose; two by Dr. Weems of South River, three by Dr. Ridout of Annapolis, three by Mr. Henry Leef of this city, one by the will of Gen. McDonald, and one by Mr. Ed. Wright. Most of these people were well supplied with a good outfit of clothing, tools, &c., by their owners, and we cannot forbear mentioning, that Mr. Wright added the liberal donation of \$50, to the society. In addition to the emigrants, Dr. McGill, Mrs. Russwurm and servant, and Dr. Elkins, took passage in the Packet. The latter gentleman is a dentist by profession, and intends establishing himself at Monrovia, where we doubt not, he will be most gladly received and find plenty of employment. On the departure of the emigrants from the wharf, religious services were performed by the Rev. Mr. Payne of Bethel Church in this city, which we regretted not being able to attend, in consequence of other engagements, as we were informed they were very impressive and specially appropriate. The congregation on the wharf consisted principally of colored people, the personal friends of the passengers and emigrants, and others induced to witness so interesting a ceremony.

We attribute this large, and for the most part, voluntary and unsolicited increase of emigrants, entirely to the Packet, and although we may be mistaken, yet we confidently predict, that her influence is just beginning to be felt. We do not pretend to say there will not be reactions and seasons of indifference, yea, of increased and violent opposition, perhaps surpassing all we have heretofore experienced, but "Truth is great and will prevail."

On the simple operations of this Chesapeake and Liberia Trading Company, we are willing to rest the whole interests of African Colonization. We need no other argument, we require no other appeals. Let this Packet, officered and manned as she is, and commanded, as we trust she soon will be, by colored men, but continue her regular trips between this country and Liberia, freighted with emigrants and valuable cargoes consigned to, and mostly owned by colored people; let her bring back as she will at each returning trip, the produce of the African soil, with a greater or less number of colonists, either on business or on visits to their friends, and there cannot longer be any misapprehension as to the character of the colonies or the destinies of those who emigrate thither. Affirmations and assurances of those who can be supposed to be interested, will no longer be necessary. The evidence will all be the evidence of facts, or of those who can have no interest in misrepresentation. If then colonization falls, it deserves it, let it fall,—but we fear no such result. Let us work on.

---

We have greatly enlarged our borders the present month, in order to furnish our readers entire, with a series of letters addressed to a prominent member of Congress from Vermont, by a citizen of Maryland. The principal drift or object of the writer appears to be to introduce the North and South to each other, or to make them acquainted with each other's leading characteristics and principles of action. We consider his object has in a great degree been attained, and no one can doubt, but much good will result from a general dissemination of the letters. But, let it be distinctly understood, that we endorse none of the writer's peculiar views upon the subjects of slavery or state sovereignty. This Journal is not the place for their discussion. Although the subject of colonization is not introduced into the letters, yet, as we conceive their tendency to be the production of harmony between the North and South, we believe we are making the best use of our columns, by publishing them in this state, whence the two extremes of Northern and Southern feeling come into so immediate contact. The writer remarks that he is a colonizationist. He is so in practice as well as theory, having manumitted at sundry times, some fifty people, who have emigrated to the Colony of Maryland in Liberia; and from the letters he receives from them, and the great improvement in the character and deportment of several, who have returned to visit him, he has the high satisfaction of feeling that he has done his duty in transferring their liberty to their own hands, and placing them in a situation where they can enjoy it.

[From the New York Courier and Enquirer.]

## THE NORTH AND SOUTH.

## NO. I.

TO THE HON. GEORGE P. MARSH:

Allow me sir, in addressing you thus publicly, to refer briefly to the circumstances to which I owe the honor of your personal acquaintance.

In your Speech delivered in the House of Representatives, at Washington, on the Texas question, as published in the National Intelligencer newspaper of the 15th of February, 1845, I read as follows:

"But in regard to this change of ignorance and passion, I will, in all seriousness suggest to southern gentlemen a measure, which I honestly believe would do much, very much, towards dispelling those clouds of ignorance, and calming whatever exists of feverish passion. Let candid and intelligent men from the slaveholding States visit the North, and call meetings of all political parties to hear this subject discussed. I confidently predict that the most zealous advocate, even of slavery itself, who should address the people of the North on this subject in decent and respectful language, would, not only be attentively listened to, but civilly and even kindly treated. Instead of being lynched, as any of the supporters of the right of petition would be at the South, he would be feasted and caressed; and fanatics, incendiaries as we are, there is not on this floor a Northern gentleman who would not shed the last drop of his blood in defending a Southerner against any who should assail him for maintaining the rights and interests of his own State, in such language as becomes a freeman and a gentleman."

The patriotism which is here expressed, excited my warm admiration. I sought to know personally the statesman, who from the high places of the nation expressed himself thus:—I have that honor.

You and I, sir, are not alone in the wish that the people of these two great sections of our country, the North and the South, might understand, and know, and appreciate each other better than they now do. How this "consummation devoutly to be wished" may be attained, is an important question.

I seek to show why Southern politicians cannot address Northern audiences on the subject of slavery. Diversity in character and circumstances constitutes an insuperable obstacle.

I must needs enter into some partial analysis of society as it exists both in the North and in the South, in order to evince the truth of my proposition.

The people of the North, and of the South, have been extremely diverse from their beginning hitherto. It will be sufficiently accurate to answer all present purposes, to regard the Plymouth (Mass.) and the Jamestown (Vir.) colonies, as the germ of Northern and Southern civilization; for to these, in point of character, those colonies which settled in the neighbourhood of each, sufficiently conform.

Quite a different people were our Puritan fathers, from those who constituted the germ of the Ancient Dominion, and the adjacent States. Had they been alike, the diversity of climate and condition, in their domineering influence over man, had, ere this, made them essentially different.

Montesquieu, in his "Spirit of Laws" informs us, that the people of such a climate as New England, will be moral, great lovers of liberty,—incapable of being made slaves. He tells us also, that, under the heat of the torrid zone, it happens that the inhabitants prefer to be slaves, rather than "endure the insupportable fatigue of thought" necessary to self conduct.

We, a highly civilized people, stretch from latitude forty-nine degrees in the North, Southwards over twenty-three degrees, almost to the torrid zone. The past history of governments affords no parallel. All hitherto tried maxims of government are against our success. The perpetuity of our Union is doubtful.

It would seem natural to suppose that hope might arise from explaining to the people of the extreme sections of our country, the diversity which exists between themselves and their confederated brethren; and the causes which have acted, and do, and must continue to act, to produce this diversity. If all this were explained and enforced by patriots of competent influence with the people, it would still be a matter of sufficient doubt to cause solicitude, whether the masses generally, could be brought under that habitual conviction of difference in character between themselves and people, separated twenty-three degrees of latitude from them, which would induce them to make that allowance which is necessary to harmony.

You may belt the earth with a zone of ten degrees of latitude, and hope to unite the inhabitants in one Republic, with better prospect of success, than you can the twenty-three particular degrees which we inhabit, even though the domain were more limited in breadth than that which we possess.

The representatives of oranges and of ice meet at Washington in legislation, and verily as is their climate, so are they.

The civilization of the N. England States, and that of the Southern States are different, as much so as any two highly civilized nations upon earth, and the inhabitants are mutually more unknown to each other, as consistent communities of men, than are those of any two distinct nations. It is to be regretted that while the Northern or the Southern scholar may take from his library a volume, and may, at his leisure, obtain a good knowledge of any other, and of all other civilized communities, he has no means of knowing philosophically the people of the States united with him by national ties, but by absolutely going and taking up his residence among them.

The civilization which has obtained for upwards of two centuries, both in the New England and in the Southern States, will be one day written, doubtless, faithfully, fearlessly, and philosophically. We are rich in men capable of learning enough, and even of those who actually know enough, if their learning was of the right kind, to qualify them for such an undertaking; but that there is among us, at this time, a man possessed of an adequate knowledge, both of the North and of the South, to do justice to both, and to the subject, is questionable. There is no tendency in our institutions to produce men of this particular qualification. We make no statesmen, if the term statesmen be allowed to mean men who are acquainted with the character of the people whose affairs they manage. And unfortunately the working of our system, in its progressive development, notwithstanding the facilities to intercommunication through the introduction of steam, tends otherwise than to the production of such men.

Perhaps an independent philosophical foreigner, who neither cared what the North said of him, or the South, or what they both said or thought of him, might write the history of our civilization, and speak of us as we are. Such a book will one day be written—and all that I propose to do, is to reach forward and tear out for present use, a leaf or two from this production yet to be.

The settling of the Plymouth Colony, was strictly a religious enterprise. Take the religion of the Puritans for your guide, and that with all its peculiarities, and New England society at once discloses an analysis. The moral idea has ever run ahead,—has outrun and eclipsed all other ideas.

To the idea of morality, everything in New England civilization conforms as by instinct. Around morality the minor matters of society arrange themselves, like ferruginous particles about a loadstone. All the elements obey this general law.

The Puritans were religionists. Their embarkation for settlement in this Western world was a religious enterprise—they sought religious liberty. If at any period of the history of the Plymouth settlement; there were a majority of the community religious, it is not unreasonable to suppose that morality should gain the ascendancy of a ruling law. Morality once predominant, habit would favor conformity thereto in the subsequent progress of society.

Nor is the truth of a general law of the philosophy of society necessarily affected by the increase or decrease of that quality in the community to which it owed its being. True morality may have increased, without giving to the law any greater ascendancy than it had before; or it may have declined, and the former exist without the power. If such be the law, the conformity to it, of which I speak, will be, on the part of the truly and sincerely moral, cordial and heartfelt, and those who are not so, will show their allegiance by being hypocrites. The politician and demagogue, if not truly moral, either consciously or unconsciously pay court to the law, by using it in a way which appears best fitted to subserve their ends.

There are peculiarities in the morality of New England, some of which it is my painful duty to mention. You and I, sir, have heard in New England, that the Puritans had been persecuted. Whether they had or had not been persecuted; whether they did or did not persecute, I touch not. Let that matter rest in dread repose. They came to this country to enjoy religious liberty; and used unwonted liberty with religious systems. Their most important moral innovation, in its influence in forming society to what we now find it, was the decreeing to the laity the power of conferring sacred functions. The laity are competent to invest one of their number with the clerical office,—with authority to minister in holy things. Such a laity of course retain, not only more power, for that which can make, can unmake; but more competency in religious matters generally, than has ever pertained to any body of laity before. Independency was invented. Other religious systems have been and still are in the process of being invented. Unrestrained liberty and great success have attended, for a long time such a people. (God grant that they may not undermine their priceless liberty by attempting to impose their peculiar views upon those in another latitude, who are confederate with them for no other purpose, but that in union there might be lasting strength given to liberty.) Is it strange that such a people should possess this one other trait, an absolute persuasion that their principles are destined to renovate this whole earth?

When did ever a people possessed of such attributes exist before? Holy Writ alone describes what they deem themselves to be—"A chosen generation, a royal priest-hood, an holy nation, a peculiar people."—It is such a morality as this which is invading the rights of the sovereign people of more than one-half of the territorial limits of this Union.

Independency became the prevailing religion of New England. It was a bold deviation from the previously received maxims of Christian nations.—There was nothing to prevent its full development in New England. It has had two centuries of development—the results are extant.—As our forefathers invented a system of religion, we, their sons, have not acknowledged their superiority in this power of originality, but have gone on inventing.

The New England people are not more distinguished for their invention



in mechanics, by which your Patent Office is replenished with models, than are they for their inventions in morals. Indeed the idea that the true notion of a church may remain yet to be discovered from the Bible, is a prevailing sentiment imbibed in infancy in New England.

These two ideas are the leading ones from which I propose to solve the mysteries which are involved in the part which New England is taking on the subject of Slavery, namely, that their morality must progress:—and that morality affords an open field for discovery.

The New England people are not a priest-ridden people. They have a people ridden clergy. However, in all the phases which human society assumes, God "magnifies his word above all his name," and it happens that there is "like people, like priest."—There are no more Millers, and Mormon priests, than the public taste requires. It is the state of the public taste which causes them to arise.

The Puritans who landed on the Plymouth Rock were moral, and somewhat peculiarly so. New England society of the present day is what it might be expected to be; it bears strong lineaments of "the Rock whence it was hewn." The morality of the Puritans, such as it was, has been carried into effect. It surmounted obstacles, it "has been strong and done exploits." It has triumphed. Moral views which could no where else give law, have there given law. New England morality is used to doing as it pleases, and to accomplish what it undertakes. Its career has been marked by success; it has inscribed victory on its banners. In the name of God, it treads down all its foes. Its wont is to attack every thing which it dislikes. It is true it struck at Sunday mails, and it struck a rock. But then it assaulted freemasonry, and it fell. Over the intemperate use of ardent spirits, it has signally triumphed. It has turned its attention to the slavery of the South as fair game, and commenced its assaults. It is a spirit intoxicated from its debauch on liberty and universal toleration, which is to be met and rebuked.

So philosophical is the structure of New England society, so perfectly harmonious and of a piece is it, so strictly do all the phenomena which it exhibits result from causes which are known to exist, that to me none of the phases which it is putting on, occasion surprise.

Still I maintain that New England character is a perfect enigma to Southern society. This I trust will not appear so very strange, while I offer some remarks on Southern society. This I must defer to a future occasion.

---

## NO. II.

"Sir, here is newly come to our court Laertes, believe me, an absolute gentleman, full of most excellent differences, of very soft society, and great show. Indeed to speak feelingly of him, he is the very card or calendar of gentry, for you shall find in him the substance of what part a gentleman would see."

In my former letter, I made some observations on that perilous and hitherto almost entirely unessayed subject, the philosophy of society in the North of our beloved country.

To a no less perilous undertaking, I stand pledged, to offer some remarks on Southern society.

Society in the South, conforms to a different general law from that of New England. The law of manners rules in the South. Manners are here cultivated with assiduity from the cradle to the grave. The country people contest the palm of urbanity, with the city people. And truly, isolated



country life, with sparse settlement, as is the case in the South, is favorable to the attainment of that high philosophical breeding of which I now speak; which consists in making the most of a man when you meet with one,—in conferring delight on him, and at the same time enriching one's-self with all the information which he possesses.

The intercourse of cities is fitted to confer polished manners. The constant friction of society there produces its effects. But it is in the country, where individual families are widely separated; where social relations are held with but few families; where the scene of life presents but little incident; it is there, if the passion for it exists, that the mine of social and conversational power is dug deep. If excelling man but deems it worthy of himself to excel in such attainments, large results will doubtless be obtained.

In the South, books are few, but of standard quality, well read and digested; social companions few, but entertained with abundance of leisure, and under circumstances of freedom from all servile occupation. The gentleman results; who is a gentleman at all times, and in all places; alike in the country and in the city; in the poor man's hovel, and in kings' courts.

He that, in a retired country habitation, can entertain you for a month, can without difficulty entertain you, or be entertained by you, for half an hour or five minutes; he that understands man, and habitually gives himself the trouble to treat him with regard, meets with no society, where human beings are more, or other than men.

Manners attain in the South, the ascendancy of organic law. Assiduity to please, from habit, appears to have lost its assiduity, and seems instinctive. All social power, all intellectual endowment, all acquired knowledge are freely laid as an offering, on the shrine of manners.

The highest encomium that is passed upon man, or at least that which is a *sine qua non* to his acceptability, is to pronounce him a gentleman. The loftiest statesman is not above this law, and the humblest negro is not beneath aspiring to be, in his grade of society, a gentleman.

I have never met with a man in the South, that was too high, or one that was too low, or one that lacked a motive for conciliating me.

Manners are cultivated, not without a motive. A due return in the way of popularity and influence, is expected and realized. In this trait of the South, lies the true philosophical secret of the ascendancy which it maintains over the presidential chair, and not where the Abolitionists are assiduously teaching in the representation of three-fifths of the slave population.

The sturdy uncompromising morality of puritan descent is unfavorable to rule in a country where the promise has not yet been realized—"Thy people shall be all righteous." When the millenium arrives, the North will produce her due proportion of Presidents, and Vermont, the State most distinguished in the Union, for the morality of her public men, will wear her morality as "a diadem of beauty."

Society is homogeneous. All the elements bear due relation to each other. The manners which I have described, are with each individual a personal thing, which he ever carries with him. They have for an essential concomitant, a sense of character. The laws of honor must necessarily, in a community of such men, exist as a code. A sense of personal character extends itself to family, and personal friends, over whose honor the individual naturally feels a guardianship. It naturally extends itself to the remotest borders of the sovereign State, of which the individual is a member. Thence its broader and more diffused circle widens and extends, till it embraces the whole sisterhood of confederate Republics which form the Union, and constitute the American Nation.

I therefore naturally, as an individual of such a community, feel a sense of injury if you treat me with disrespect,—if you treat my family with disrespect,—if you speak disrespectfully of my friend in my presence,—if you speak disrespectfully of my State,—if a foreigner speaks disrespectfully of my country, in my presence.

Need I say, sir, that a very different habitual feeling pervades the people of the North? They admit that the merits of themselves, their families and friends may be made the subject of legitimate discussion. They hold that what is in this way painful, may be made profitable.—That disparaging things said of themselves or of their State, which cannot be sustained in point of fact, do the affirmer more injury than any one else.

It may produce any but pleasurable feelings in a citizen of Vermont, to hear reproach cast upon his State, by one of another State. Nevertheless he sees no occasion for showing passion, or resentment, at such an occurrence. Indeed he feels none. The idea of right and wrong, truth and falsehood, is habitually present to his mind, by a law of which he is unconscious, by virtue of which, in such a case, his thoughts are occupied with these, to the exclusion of all other distinctions. The showing which can be made in the matter, is all that he deems important. If that which is asserted, so much to the discredit of his State, be true, he has no quarrel with him who affirms it. If the contrary can be proved, he will attempt to prove it. Evidence and argument is all that he thinks becomes him on such an occasion.

He does not feel himself particularly called on to avenge the honor of his State; nor will he, or can he consistently with his principles defend it, any farther than it is in the right. It is the worth of his State in which he takes an honest pride. Its blemishes and defects, he feels bound to acknowledge.

Education is more generally diffused at the North than at the South. A more distinct demarcation of the grades in society, is visible in the South. The nearest approximation of the two people, is in their highest grades, and the deviation greatest, in their lower grades. The people of the two sections of country, most distinguished for education and refinement, associate harmoniously together, and entertain a mutual high regard for each other.

The people of New England of humble condition, are more to be relied upon than those of a similar rank in the South. Education and the law of morality, taking its rise from a consciousness of accountability to God, both combine to confer, and invigorate principle; while the law of manners, can in the nature of the case, only confer adequate force upon the higher grades. In other words, the law of morals bears equably upon all, while the law of manners binds only in proportion to the stake the individual has in society.

Myself, right or wrong, my friend right or wrong, my State right or wrong, my country right or wrong, are maxims which are likely to find more favor in the South, than in the North. There is more of what might be called political patriotism in the South, than in the North, which holds its attachment to the Union subservient to its morals. Hence the momentous importance that it should have correct moral views. We must do right without regard to consequences, is a prevailing maxim at the North. It is right to abolish slavery, or dissolve the Union, says the fanatic.

The predominant law of the South assigns to every individual in community a character, which he has special charge over, to keep. The ruling law of the North, incidentally impairs this individuality of character, or destroys it altogether. It makes each individual a priest to do sacrifice on the altar of this great Moloch of Northern reliance, Northern morality. Every individual is part and parcel of this sectional morality, and he lacks

personality of character when viewed apart from it. His standard of judging, and that by which he is also judged, is the one maxim of his law. It admits of no question but that of right or wrong, and that of course as the community to which he belongs understands matters of right and wrong.

I doubt not, you sir, now readily perceive how it happens that the Southerner is a man of courteous, chivalrous bearing; and everything that is ungentlemanly ought long since, to have been expelled from the entire South. And according to the moral law, moral evil ought no longer to taint the bracing atmosphere of the North. But alas, for the natural incidents of the best regulations of communities! Fanaticism in manners, and fanaticism in morals, are the incidents. The lofty bearing of the Southern statesman some times vindicates itself through the duel.—And through other grades of society the same happens; and particularly in the more recently settled parts of the South-west, with less gentlemanly weapons. The maxim of Napoleon is verified; and there is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous. In the lowest grades of civilization, physical strength gains the ascendancy as in savage life; and the term *gentleman* comes to mean nothing more than a ferocious brute. On the other hand in the North the beauty of holiness is deformed by religious phrenzy; and the term *christian*, represents an incarnate fiend.

Having affirmed the ascendant law of each community, which is the thing chiefly to our purpose, we leave the rest unessayed. We would simply remark that as that which does not constitute the ascendant law, but is secondary to it, is that upon which popularity does not depend, and that as manners are not in the ascendant in the North, it would follow by natural consequence, that manners would there be the purer on that account, so it is in fact: and also as religion is not that upon which popularity depends, in the South, religion is there the purer on that account.

We have noticed some of the diversities which exist between the North and the South, considered as separate communities of men. It would be well for me, and well for the Union, if no other duty lay before me but to show how, in view of these diversities of character and climate, the two communities should act towards each other.—*But they have acted.* And in the matter of slavery, they have exhibited their diversities in progression. Each community has estimated the other, not in view of the other's peculiarities; but under the influence of its own peculiarities, has reasoned from itself to the other. Diversity now exists in the form of a palpable controversy. And in my next, I will endeavor to show why Southern politicians cannot, at present, address Northern audiences, while I approximate to an inquiry into the state of this controversy.

---

### NO. III.

SIR: It were worse than useless, it were wanton mischief, to apply the dissecting knife to society as in my two preceding letters, were it not that the diversity pointed out, has an important connection with the explanation of the difficulties which exist between these two sections of our country, the North and the South.

We are beings of limited faculties, and when the minds of individuals, or of communities of men, are shown to be occupied with one great object of paramount pursuit, it accounts for their overlooking or entirely neglecting other considerations.

Where manners or morals have been held in predominant estimation through successive generations, example and precepts make the individual an unconscious subject in early childhood. He grows up under a convic-

tion that what he sees is right, and perceives not that there is any thing distinguishing in the habits which he is acquiring. He naturally expects that as things are in the community of which he is a member, so are they in all civilized communities. He is not aware that there is any undue stress laid upon one acquisition to the neglect of others. His affections are early enlisted, he obeys the ruling law unconsciously and from love.

When he comes to know that the object of eminent pursuit is a distinguishing excellence of the community to which he belongs, and of himself as an individual member of that community, he comes to value himself upon it.

The Northern people are not only moral as a community, but consider it as the highest praise to be called a moral community. The Southern people are not only well bred and chivalrous, but they deem it a high encomium to be so regarded.

Now that any considerable change is to be suddenly wrought in these two communities is not to be presumed or thought of—"Hath a nation changed its Gods?" We must deal with communities as we find them.

Sir, there is no trait in the best articles which I have seen from the North, on slavery, written with the best intentions, that is so remarkable to my mind, or which is so distinctive of the peculiarities of New England character, which I have pointed out, as that by which it unconsciously assumed that the question of slavery in the United States is rightfully up for discussion, and that the Northern people really have something to do with it. Here lies the principal issue. And I do assure you, sir, that I should be inclined to regard this whole discussion as a solemn farce, if I had not some acquaintance with the history of New England society.

What if the whole exterior civilized world, and nineteen-twentieths of the citizens of the Union are opposed to slavery? Still the political question is all settled, defined and fixed, as far as the United States is concerned.

This question was settled once, when Great Britain acknowledged our independence. It was settled again when our present Constitution was formed, and the sovereign States retained their sovereignty over this subject. And if any doubt has arisen as to the true location of the power of control over slavery, from the diversity of understanding which the Constitution has received, this is all settled by experience had.

Sovereignty is in its nature such that it cannot long lie dormant. Where it is, there it will show itself to be. It plainly shows itself to reside with the States, any thing in, or supposed to be in the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding. Every individual State in the Union has done, and will continue to do, what it pleases on the subject of slavery and the negro.

Abolitionism has its rise, progress and present existence in moral considerations felt or feigned. It has never had a throb of existence, nor will it have one, but what is enforced by moral considerations.

As a natural consequent to the diversity in character and condition which exists between Northern and Southern society, the South have incorrect impressions of the relations which abolitionism bears to Northern society. To them it remains an inexplicable mystery why abolitionism is not put down at the North, by statutory enactments, or in some other way abolished.

They sincerely believe that if a faction existed in the South, having as direct a tendency to produce insurrection in the North, as they know abolitionism has to produce disaster in the South, they would quell it without ceremony. Reasoning from themselves to others, according to natural principles, they cannot conceive how Northern toleration of abolitionism can be accounted for, except upon the supposition that the Northern people are all, or at least a majority of them, abolitionists.

They hear, and they believe, that the Northern people are an educated people. Education is connected in their minds with lofty chivalry and patriotism. The Southerner has seen men of very limited education, who were unexceptionable in their bearing and deportment, but having never seen it otherwise, he connects education in his mind with certain ennobling virtues peculiar to his community.

It is therefore unaccountable to him how Northern educated gentlemen should allow men to instruct them in matters of which the teachers themselves know nothing, as in the case of abolition lecturers.

The better part of society does not attend these lectures. The Southerner fails to perceive and do the North justice in this particular. They do not perceive that you connect this forbearance towards abolitionists with your ideas of liberty, that cherished spirit of your community from the first, that native product of your clime.

You hold that error will work its own downfall. Confident in the strength of the principles which you have adopted, and having exhibited your attachment to them at Bunker Hill, and at other places, and at all times and places where you perceived such manifestation to be required, you hold the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and a jealous watchfulness over the elective franchise, as objects of your most cherished devotion. You feel yourselves therefore as much compelled to let abolitionism live, in illustration of your principles, as a Southerner does to revenge an intended personal insult.

Besides abolitionism has not risen up among you anonymously, but philosophically, and in perfect harmony with the spirit of the age, and the spirit of the people among whom it exists.

New England toleration of abolitionism is no more to be wondered at, or imputed to it as a crime, than its toleration of every thing else which chooses to come along. Do they not tolerate the thousand and one sects, religious and irreligious, which rise up among them? Did ever human being invent a sort of religion so absurd as that it would not gain adherents in New England? Is not Mormonism, Millerism, Come-outism, and every other "ism" acceptable there?

As well might the mass of the people be regarded as all Millerites, because they allowed those wretched fanatics to act out their sentiments among them, and bring the world to an end in their own way, as to suppose them not disgusted with abolitionism because they tolerate it. To put down abolitionism is impossible in a community which puts down nothing but tyranny and oppression.

The whole North hold anti-slavery principles, but then they hold them in such a way, that at what time an army of ten thousand fanatics could be raised to go down to the South, to liberate the slaves, an army of fifty thousand freemen, their keepers, would start with them, to see that they did no mischief. Let the moral question about slavery become settled, and abolitionism is dead. You cannot drum up adherents in New England for abolishing anything but that which you make appear to be morally evil. The daughters of New England, and the worthy dupeable gentlemen, are not so far gone that a proposition to abolish the Union will take with them, unless it can be made to appear that the glory of God requires it.

Disconnect the clergy of New England from the subject of abolitionism, and it dies. Bribe them to stop their mouths, buy them off, or, as a Western man would say, choke them off, or get them off, in any way you please, and abolitionism is at an end.

It is your inferior clergy, if such a term can be said to have any meaning in such a community, that are teaching, to the upturning of this Union, if it gets upturned, that slavery is contrary to the word of God.

Your real divines hold their peace; and that not because they find nothing to say on the subject of slavery from the Bible, but because they know that if they speak as they think on this subject, their churches, founded on Independency, will explode like bomb shells, and they themselves will be blown, not exactly sky-high, for then they would take an happy exit from this world of trouble.

They, however, partake of that sectional abhorrence of slavery, which is, at least, in part, a product of the climate, and as plainly as they read slavery from the beginning to the end of the Bible, yet they think it desirable that all should be free.

Sir, if the opinions of eminent divines were respected in New England as in the days of yore, and such were invited to expound the teachings of the Bible on this subject, you would have no occasion for Southern politicians to quell "the madness of the people."

The system according to which the laity make and unmake the clergy, is in a stage of progressive development, but the end is not yet.

If I am right in supposing that the only aspect in which the subject of slavery can at present be discussed to any good effect between the North and the South, is that of its morality as taught by the Word of God, you will readily perceive that Southern politicians would feel that there was some incongruity in their explaining the Bible to Northern audiences, none of which would be convened without comprising at least several *clergymen*. For Southerners habitually deferring to the clergy in the matter of explaining the Bible, under such circumstances, would feel altogether too sensibly that they had *got out of their latitude*.

It is religious phrensy that the country has reason to fear, and it is my solemn belief that if the mass of moral mind is not correctly informed on the subject of the African race, the Union determines. You cannot abolish slavery, for God is pledged to sustain it. That he has pledged himself to perpetuate this Union, I find nowhere written.

There is one specific subject which appears to me worthy of the attention of Northern statesmen—the enfranchisement of the colored population, which is progressing at the North. This matter to my apprehension, wears an ominous aspect. A seeming paradox exists. Since the introduction of steam, intercommunication between the North and the South has increased, and a proportionably greater number of personal friendships have probably arisen between the people of these two great sections of our country, than before existed. Yet the deep, silent, but fearful sectional alienation is increasing. I will speak of the past and intimate therefrom the probable future.

It is now a matter of history, that free, or runaway colored persons have lectured politically at the North. That in the last presidential campaign, such persons were listened to by gaping multitudes of the moral Northern people. That the distinguished statesman, patriot and philanthropist, Henry Clay, was on this wise villified and asspersed.

No harm done yet. All perfectly fair.—Every thing is fair in politics. And though the most virulent political opponent, whom this, our distinguished countryman, has in the South, who at home has the immunities of the appellation, *a gentleman*, conceded to him—would have burnt with indignation at the desecration, had he witnessed it, yet there is no harm done yet, no breakers ahead.

In Vermont no distinction is, or ever has been known, either in Constitution or Statute, between colored and white citizens.—In the New England States lying upon the Atlantic, which were originally slaveholding, not only has slavery been by statute abolished, but that favorite object of reform, the

abolition of all laws which make a distinction between colored and white people, has been, in a greater or less degree consummated. No harm yet.

Free black mariners, tutored in Boston under the immediate auspices of Garrison and his press, have found it in their way to enter Southern ports. They have under the law, been arrested, imprisoned, and detained. No harm yet. The North are forbearing. They have with all due legislative deliberation, determined on sending, and have sent their choice civilians down to those Southern ports, to test these matters in a legal way. Their emissaries have, on arriving at their separate places of destination, and making known their errand, observed indications which were conclusive to their minds, that the only chance for personal safety which remained to them, was to disappear without delay. They have been discreet and all is well. The North are true to their climate, and to their principles. They never fight, until they see what they deem a worthy cause for fighting, and we yet enjoy great repose.

The South have, according to their estimation of the action required, duly lynched or committed to their penitentiaries, all the fanatics which have appeared among them, whether clerical or lay, male or female. And through excess of zeal, some may have suffered who deserved a better fate. Yet all is tranquil.

One step further in the march of advancement—and that is not unlikely to occur; the way has been duly paved for it; and I have observed Southern society for twenty years, to little purpose, if there is not trouble.

Let but one Southern man be convicted on Northern soil, on negro testimony, or be tried by a jury with but one colored man on it, and not more certainly does the leafing of the fig-tree indicate that "summer is now nigh at hand," than does this event indicate, that the end of this Union, with all its goodliness, and with all its blood-consecrated associations "is nigh even at the doors." Let but such an event happen, and the match is applied to the train. "The Declaration of Independence," as now held and construed in the North, has worked out its inevitable effects. Tampering with social systems here, as in France, has wrought to a definite end. And as Governor Hammond, in his letter to Clarkson, expressed it, "another cycle of blood and devastation has dawned upon the world."

The South vouchsafes no reply to anything which rests upon negro testimony, because they regard the heeding of it as beneath all contempt. They are not aware that it has any weight with any at the North, who regard themselves as of consequence enough to be worthy of being despised.

Southern people as instinctively take it for granted that their Northern friends know that a negro's testimony is not to be relied upon, as Northern people do that the negro is a poor unfortunate oppressed being, that has been unwarrantably seized upon, and degraded from the high estate of intellect and mental aspiration, to the level of a slave, and that he needs nothing but to have the despotism of his master broken, in order to his rising buoyantly and at once, to a level with themselves.

Sir, I agree with you, that it would have an excellent effect, if Southern gentlemen could address assemblies of the Northern people on the subject of slavery. I trust that from my general remarks on Northern and on Southern society, much of the embarrassment which lies in the way of the attainment of so desirable an object, has presented itself to your mind. The difficulty may be generally stated by saying of both the Southerner and the Northerner, that each is a man of but one climate and community, and that of a different one from the other. As well might a tailor attempt to cut broadcloth with but one side of a pair of shears, as for either of these men successfully to address the citizens of the opposite community, upon a sub-



ject that so deeply involves their distinctive peculiarities as that of slavery.

Whatever rough discussion may come from a Southerner on the floor of Congress, where he acts in his representative capacity, I think you will agree with me in saying that he is affable, courteous, and conciliating, wherever else you meet with him. If he could be prevailed on to waive the strong position in which he is now intrenched, namely that slavery is not a proper subject for discussion, and that he will defend it to the death on his own soil, and nowhere else: if he could, from motives of patriotism, to which he is ever feelingly alive, be induced to go to the North and address the people, he would take all his habitual consciousness of becoming deportment along with him, and that would lead him to defer to the Northern people, while he was their guest. He would be forbidden by the law to which he conforms, and loves and prides himself on, to say any thing uncomplimentary to the people in a public address. He could therefore say nothing on slavery. For as he naturally judges others by himself, and other communities by his own, he cannot conceive of the idea that he may brow-beat the Northern people on their own soil, and that they will love and respect him the more for it. He knows that such dealing would not be kindly taken in his own community, and therefore, he will not do as he would not be done by. Would to God, he could perceive that forbearance in the Northern people is a virtue, and not an evidence of deafness! Would to God, that the patriotic pledge which you uttered, could have fallen with all its telling influence on the South: and that those who heard it, and that those who read it, could have understood how much it meant, and that the South could appreciate that trait in the Representation and in the Constituency of the North, that renders it certain that your pledge would be literally fulfilled, and that not only is the blood of the New England delegation pledged for the defence of Southern freemen and gentlemen, on New England soil, but that all the blood of New England is so pledged!

"For what purpose," would the yeomanry of New England say to a Southern gentleman, "for what purpose, suppose you, did our fathers fight at Lexington and Bunker Hill, but to make New England a place where you may say just what you please, so you don't break any of the laws?"

The peculiar way in which devotion to liberty shows itself in New England, can never I fear, be comprehended in the South, except as a perfect idiosyncrasy.

A Southerner could not honor New England pride more than by committing himself to their keeping, unarmed and alone, while he uttered the most hardmouthed rebukes, which his honest convictions of truth would dictate. Nothing would give the New England people greater pleasure, than an opportunity thus to exemplify their devout attachment to liberty. Sir, a smile must needs play upon your countenance, when you learn from Governor Hammond's letter to Clarkson, that in South Carolina, "small guards in our cities, and occasional patrols in the country, ensure us a repose and security known nowhere else."

Could Gov. Hammond any where sleep sweeter or safer than he might in Vermont, immediately after he had told the assembled freemen of that State, just what he thought of them, and in the most undisguised manner the worst he thought of them?

One of the first arguments which an individual Southerner would be likely to use with an individual Northerner, as he views the matter of slavery, would be, that interference on the part of the North, is a breach of etiquette which the inhabitants of the several States ought to observe towards each other, and that it is fitted to produce alienation of feeling, and disunion.

The Northerner is unaffected by this argument, and it is worse than uselessly urged, because of that peculiarity in Northern mind, by virtue of which, the first question to be asked about everything is, that naked abstract one whether it is right or wrong? This abstraction he has ever, like an optical delusion, before his mind. This impracticable moral abstraction is a stumbling-block to the New Englander, whenever he goes out of New England. He insists on having this question first answered. And if the answer is, as he has long since settled it in his mind, that slavery is wrong, then he replies, that it ought to be immediately abandoned. And if anything is said about the difficulty, danger, or disaster which would attend such a course, his reply is, we must do right, and leave consequences to God. Whether honestly, fanatically, or hypocritically, he uses this argument, and relies upon it.

The Southerner knows not how to appreciate him, or his argument, and is ready to say, "see how he seeketh a quarrel against me." Nothing is farther from the Northerner's wish, or intention, than a quarrel. He is a subject of puritan morality, which has a work to do everywhere, and with everybody,—decorum, etiquette, probability of success, and every thing else, out of the question.—He knows not how to begin to conceive the idea, that his notions of morals are all Greek to the Southerner, who knows no morals against which the argument, that a measure will produce more harm than good, or that it will produce unmitigated evil is not valid.

Sir, I deem that enough has been said to show what I proposed; namely, that Southern politicians, cannot under existing circumstances, address Northern audiences, on the subject of slavery. Here I might close. But with your leave, I will, with a view to further illustrations, look a little closer at the controversy which exists between the North and the South on the subject of slavery, by viewing it in its relations to the General and to the State Governments.

---

#### NO. IV.

Sir: Incidentally to the diversities which in my former communications have been mentioned, it happens, that the South have several decided advantages over the North, which conspire to give them ascendancy in the General Government.

It would seem that the great advantage which results to the South, in point of securing popular favor in this Republic, from having made manners a specific object of cultivation through successive generations, would of itself be sufficient to account for the ascendancy which exists.

But in addition to this, it rests on good Northern authority, that they have also made politics a particular object of study and pursuit. Their principal advantage, however, is, that the ruling law of the South is in perfect accordance with the theory of the General Government. As a nation, we have adopted the theory that Government does not involve the matter of religion. On this theory our constitution is based.

The South, according to Northern showing, have made almost all the Presidents, and have secured to themselves much the larger share of the offices of honor, emolument and trust, under the General Government, and consequently have the advantage which the practical conducting and handling of affairs gives, which is the most perfect and complete of all advantages. The advantage of practice and experience, are great over inexperience, however, correct and consummate in theory an individual may be. The practical politicians and statesmen of this government are from the South.

In point of fact, the North with all their wealth, education, intellectual and moral worth, have waned in relative influence.—On these hints political abolitionism takes its rise. Here it germinates and feeds its existence.

Real worth is unassuming—is modest and retiring. This I believe, is admitted as a general maxim. Whether so admitted or not, it is law in New England. Though some local forwardness may exist among New Englanders at home, yet there, generally, and always abroad, they expect that their worth will be discovered and brought to notice by somebody other than themselves.

Morality being the ascendant law in the North, Northern members of Congress represent a powerfully swaying and enterprising morality. Being local men themselves and selections out of the homogeneous mass, it is hardly to be supposed that they fully comprehend the embarrassments of their position when called on to act as statesmen for the country. New England ascendant morality, in a way unconscious to themselves, mingling with all their conceptions of politics and government, they are to act under a Constitution, which not only does not affirm any particular moral faith, but expressly declares that none shall be imposed. All then that is said on the floor of Congress on the subject of slavery, which brings its moral bearing into the account, is irrelevant to the matter in hand—is, whether perceived or unperceived, in effect proposing the moral opinions of somebody to the acceptance of somebody else—is unstatesman-like—is embarrassing to the individual in the way of national preferment, and yet is imposed on him by the sense of his constituents.

A New England member seems to be laid under a necessity to act against slavery simply because it is wrong, that is, morally wrong. And this is precisely that thing which, in the relations imposed on him as a member of the Congress of the United States, he has nothing to do with.

The embarrassments which New England statesmen labor under, seem to be indicated by the physical conformation of the United States. Situated not exactly in the north-east corner of the Union, but even more north-east than that, on an absolute north-eastern projection from the otherwise naturally delineated Union, the infelicity of their relative position, in point of influence in the Government, is enhanced by the fact that in their latitude, an orator has not that controlling influence over his auditory which pertains to the orator in a more Southern clime.

Leading men easily lead the people at the South. New England people nobody can lead. They will lead themselves, and if possible, their representatives in Congress; and that too in a line directly opposite to that in which their preferment in the State naturally lies. And, strange as it may seem, these same people complain that their statesmen are not preferred in the General Government. And upon this plea agitation is now actually going forward at the North, proposing for its object an alteration in that particular of the Constitution which allows representation of which the principle is population irrespective of suffrage, alledging that such representation is the cause, why dominion under the American eagle rests upon the shoulders of the South.

Pardon me, Sir, while I again impose my positive, sincere, and most deferential opinion, that it was a wise and patriotic invitation which you gave to Southern politicians to address in person the people of the North. They would appreciate yourself and your worthy compeers from the North the better after doing so. Some cementing influence to the Union would result therefrom.

Doubtless there is lurking unconsciously in the New England mind a disposition to think for other people in moral matters. So abhorrent is the

idea of slavery to intelligent minds in Northern climes, that nothing but the meekest submission to the whole of God's revealed will, can save from error in this particular—can save "those who are without" from interfering between master and slave. "The meek will be guide in judgment, and the meek will be teach his way." And without this, they will "Teach otherwise and consent not to wholesome words." The tendencies of civilized mind are all that way. To that love of liberty and hatred of oppression which characterizes Northern climes, the fallacy of supposing that slavery is oppression seems almost instinctive. This places it in a false position towards both master and slave. Sympathy for the supposed oppressed is as strong as for the really oppressed. Indeed the laws of the human mind are such that when a real being is known to suffer, or when a real being is not known, but supposed to suffer, and when an imaginary being is supposed to suffer, the sympathy felt alike in all cases, is felt not for either of these, but for another being created by the sympathizing mind itself, and modeled in all respects after its own image. The sympathy, therefore, which is felt in Vermont, for the slaves of the South, is not felt for what the slaves actually suffer, but for what the Vermonters severally suppose that themselves would suffer, if, with all their aspirations, their love and appreciation of liberty and capacity for using it to advantage, they were degraded from their high estate to the condition of slaves.

But the facts in the case are glaringly and notoriously otherwise. The slave of the South has not as is supposed been degraded, for that he could not be, but has been constantly rising ever since he became a slave here. Where so much supposed wrong exists, the supposed wrong-doer must necessarily come in for a correlative share of misapprehension and consequent reproach.

Since the laws of mind are such as above described, and such results are natural results, they must be admitted to be correct results, if we cannot alledge counteracting laws of at least equal authority with the natural tendencies of our minds. These are found in the volume of revealed truth.—Since mind is so, non-interference is peremptorily commanded by Him, who created mind, and when it had erred, revealed to it what it imperiously needed to know.

Slavery in the United States has resulted, and is destined still more and more to result in the permanent good and advancement of the Negro race, and human device cannot make it last longer than the good of the slaves themselves requires, and human device cannot hasten its termination by any other means than by shedding of blood.

White population is supplanting colored population, whether free or bond, by an irresistible law. Thus, and thus only, is it desirable for the good of any party, or possible to terminate slavery in the South.—Such is our Southern faith on this subject.

The innovating and progressive morality of the North, requires that something should be done to discountenance slavery. This something, as far as the General Government is concerned, her statesmen in Congress are expected to do. They are expected to represent and act upon the views of their constituents.

New England statesmen, admit and maintain that they have no constitutional right to do any thing with or about the slavery which exists in the States, but that the control of that matter belongs to the sovereign States severally in which slavery exists.—Still the sense of the constituency, backed by the sense of the civilized world, urge them on to try to do something to discountenance slaveholding, and to induce the South to abandon it.

A singular fact, and that by which the diversity in character between the North and South is most strongly illustrated, is that the point of controversy on which at the present time the two communities grapple closest, is not the abolition of slavery, but the question of right to discuss the subject of slavery.

The South knew not their Northern friends as well as they might have been known, or they never would have insisted that their petitions to Congress for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia should not be received. A love of constitutional liberty and a love of morality, with all the fanatical abolitionism which adheres to it, were brought into harmonious combination. Those who were for the sacred right of petition, and those who were for the sacred right of abolitionism acted in perfect concert, and it was useless and ill judged to resist.

The right of petition being conceded, and yet the thing petitioned for being as far from being granted as ever, and remaining as desirable as ever in Northern estimation, the same thing is sought to be accomplished by exercising the right of discussion.

There are certain propositions to argue which is treason against nature. And such, have the Northern members of Congress occasion to believe, is the opinion of the South about discussion the subject of slavery. Here the position of the Northern members is still embarrassing. The North have no political power over slavery in the States. This is conceded. Yet under the constitutional provision that the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press, shall not be abridged, they have the right to discuss slavery in their own moral way. This right must be conceded, for it has been successfully maintained, that a man has a right even to shear a wolf. And the only legitimate way of dealing with a man who insists that he will shear a wolf simply because he has a right to do so, is to concede that he has that right, but to try to convince him that it is inexpedient to exercise it. There is good moral authority for maintaining that all things which are lawful are not all expedient.

Congress has declared its incompetency to discontinue Sabbath mails, the Constitution not having informed that body, what day in the week, that day is. It would be incongruous, therefore in them, to attempt to inform the slaveholder respecting his moral duties to his slaves, since it has declared itself incapable of informing him which day in the seven, that day is which his Maker commands him to keep holy, in which he is not to work himself nor to work his slave. It would be strange if the one matter could be foisted in, after the other has been excluded.

The politics and politeness of the South are ever ready. Since the North affirms the sinfulness of slavery, the former with his courtesy admits the question to be problematical, while with his politics he affirms their right under God so to sin, if indeed it be a sin to hold slaves. The Constitution not including the power of determining the moral character of actions among the enumerated powers conferred by that instrument, and as in their consciences they do not believe that it is for "The general welfare of the United States," that they should determine slaveholding either to be or not to be sin, they conclude that the powers of sinning or not sinning in the matter of slavery is "reserved to the States respectively or to the people." It is difficult to deal politically with such political ungodliness as this. And yet no less a task is imposed on the Northern members of Congress.

The South think it bad policy, bad patriotism, and bad manners on the part of the North, to ask them to give up slaveholding, after they have in the most distinct, unequivocal, and solemn manner declared, that they will terminate their slaveholding and their mortal existence simultaneously.

They habitually take others at their word, and think it belongs to good manners so to do.

Feeling, I doubt not, that the attempt to carry out Northern moral views on the floor of Congress, was but "lading one's self with thick clay," you Sir, hit upon the device of confronting the Northern constituency with these Southern politicians.

But, Sir, the object which is proposed to be gained by Southern addresses before Northern audiences requires some definition. It does not clearly appear what end a Southern politician is to propose to himself by going to the North to address the people.

Some attitude of state towards the subject of slavery, New England might reasonably be expected to present. What this attitude really is, can only appropriately be learned from her statesmen. In the mixture of politics and morality which comes from New England, is there not a little lack of clearness in the defining of political position?—Would not the good of the Union be subserved if the New England delegation were asked why, in the present well-defined position in which the South stand, the North continue to moralize with her?

And should not this interrogatory why? why? why? be reiterated, till the moral view is made to subside, and the political view is made clearly to appear?

Will the New England delegation to a man, adopt the language of the Hon. Daniel Webster? I recollect not the occasion, but from the lack of reiteration, I should suppose that it was extorted from him on some pressing occasion: "The Constitution as it is."

If they decline this, and prefer an otherwise moral one, I see not how it can be defined without amounting to something like this: We moralists urge moral considerations upon you, because we yet confidently hope to persuade you to abolish slavery. Should we despair of accomplishing this end, we may possibly feel it our duty to separate from you at all hazards, lest the wrath of God fall upon the Nation and upon us, for the sin of slaveholding.

This would be a position deeply to be respected, and one that might be reached and reasoned with. Much light would then break in from the region where mist now hangs. Southern political views would then be rendered demonstrably true, namely, that there neither is or can be any question in the purview of the Constitution, about the abolition of slavery, which does not involve the question of the continuance or dissolution of the Union. Northern anti slavery morality, so entitled to respect, would then have a way thrown open for expressing itself other than through abolitionism as is now the case. Hidden things in the way of conscientious scruples, could then be brought to light in a way in which they could be respectably met and answered.

Sir, it is no small matter which is on the tapis of the civilized world in this our day, respecting the continent of Africa, and the Negro race. The freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and the freedom of slaveholding are all impregably fortified by the Constitution of our land. The materials for a page of history, which will be read with deepest interest by coming generations is being supplied by passing events. In Congressional high places men are writing memoirs of themselves, to be inserted under the head, "Causes which conspired to avert the danger which threatened the Republic;" or, to figure on the melancholy page of "The decline and fall of the American Union." Truly the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press are doing their destined work.

The sage of Ashland, for comprehending and enacting too much of state-

man-like wisdom on the subject of slavery, is beached high and dry, not by the waves of the sea, but by that which Holy Writ puts side by side with them, "the madness of the people." I, a pro-slavery colonizationist, have learned nothing from this or any other statesman on this subject, but owe whatever I know and believe to the influences of observed truth.

---

NO. V.

SIR: By birth-right a citizen of "That State whose soil was drenched to mire, with the blood of the Revolution," I have not fought the battles of my country. I was as "One born out of due time." The mother that bare me, was, at one day old, rocked in her cradle by the jarring of the earth from Bunker Hill, and her lullaby was "The thunder of the captains and the shouting."

He that is now "a Northern man with Southern citizenship," was, in the war of 1812, a feeble boy of ten years old. I have been, in succession, a citizen of Massachusetts, of Virginia, and of Maryland. I am allied to those States by ties the tenderest and the holiest. If moral courage is required, in defence of the liberties which are mine by heirship, the inheritance which I have so fully and freely possessed, I shall not be found wanting. If a fearless announcement of obvious truth is needed, I, for one, shall prove that the blood with which this Union was bought, was not shed for me in vain. If "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and if I have not been deceived as to the maxims which "The Father of his Country" bequeathed to posterity, I shall be found upon the watchtower.

It becomes me, in thus addressing a statesman, to present fact, not feeling; argument, not egotism. And yet some apology is due for a Constitutional argument on State's right doctrines, lest I should assume to "inform princes, and teach senators wisdom."

My Constitutional argument, has more of the heart than of the head in it. The meaning of the Constitution which the framers meant—which its authorized expounders mean—which its sworn supporters mean, whether their oath is "To support it as they understand it," or otherwise, I touch not.

There is a meaning of the Constitution distinct and apart from these, modified though it is by the authoritative decisions of the Supreme Court, and by the expressed opinions of statesmen. The Constitution is from day to day, and from year to year, accomplishing its destiny; and the annals of time are recording the meaning which it actually fulfils. To this meaning of the Constitution I propose to confine my remarks.

The North had moral influence with the South, twenty years ago, on the subject of Slavery; they have none whatever now.—The positions of the two were not then as thoroughly defined as now. The North then approached the South in a respectful, deferential, Christian and prevailing spirit. Though we saw not how their views could be safely carried into practical effect, yet their mild Christian earnestness won us, and though we saw much in their reasonings which we knew to be the result of mistake and misapprehension, yet we were disposed to think that such excellence of Christian temper must, after all, be in the right.

Proceeding from New England southward, towards the equator, a relaxing of that indomitable disposition to think for one's self on all subjects, is observable. It doubtless is, in part at least, an influence of climate which disposes us to let others, our parents, our teachers, our orators—in short—those whom we respect, and to whom we are attached, think for us.

Southern youths, receiving education, at the North—Northern teachers,



particularly clerical teachers, at the South—much Northern influence has heretofore been produced on the South. The rise of colleges and universities in the South—Abolition forced upon the British West India Islands—Abolition breaking out at the North,—the public mind, both at the South and at the North roused to a state of reflection—measures taken—the result attained may be thus described. The two communities have receded in opinion from each other, and now occupy these ascertained positions. The North is comprehended and fully stated in one proposition, and one inference. To own slaves is sin. Sin must be immediately abandoned.

The South say that sin lies not in owning slaves. Sin is predicated of slave holders and of non-slave-holders irrespectively of the matter of slave-holding. A man may be in a state of allegiance to all God's revealed will, and yet be a slave-holder in perpetuity.

Slave-holders, knowing that their political rights were secure, formerly did not take the trouble to think very conclusively upon the subject; and accordingly admitted that slavery was a great moral, political, and social evil. They have now reflected as they never did before, and have arrived at the conclusion that it is not so great an evil, in either of these respects, as they had supposed.

The North have so generalized their proposition as to include us all, clerical and lay, male and female, under sin. Formerly the clergy of both sections were agreed, and they are no less so now, that it is a sin to treat slaves ill. But all this is thrown into a position of irrelevancy, in the present advanced stage of the discussion. Nothing but direct showing from the Book of God, the mutually recognized standard is in point now. The North are the aggressors. They affirm sin of us all. We wait, and shall wait in reserved silence, till they prove, or attempt to prove, from the Bible alone, what they affirm.

Notions of becomingness incident to the predominant law of manners in the South, influence them even in moral matters, so that they will not reply to any thing which appears on the subject of slavery, unless they deem it respectful, important in subject matter, and in all respects worthy of notice.

From the hap-hazard habitual style in which moral crusades are gotten up, and carried on in the North, "and see my zeal for the Lord," being deemed a valid apology for any thing, it results that the North egregiously misappreciate the South, while the South are, infelicitously, it is true, yet thoroughly informed of every thing which the North believe and think on this subject.

It is in the very nature of predominancy to pervade and mingle itself with that which is not predominant. And while the morality of the North mixes itself inseparably with the politics of the North, the manners and politics of the South mix themselves with the morality of the South.

While at the South, in consequence of the Constitution's affirming that the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press shall not be abridged, the mere naked right of the North to speak and write what they please on the subject of slavery, is conceded, it is denied that they have any right to speak and write to us on that subject.

The Constitution runs thus: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." We understand that all the benefits here conferred, must be exercised within the territorial limits of the States of which they are claimed.

For instance, the citizen of Massachusetts is, and of right can be, none the better for anything which this clause of the Constitution secures to him in Virginia, until he enters Virginia in person. In Virginia he may and

will enjoy "all privileges and immunities" which Virginians themselves there enjoy. The privilege of freely entering the State, and of demeaning himself as they demean themselves, of doing as they do, is his, even to his so claiming and so enjoying, up to a fixed period of time, when he acquires, in addition to what he has already enjoyed, citizenship itself. No difficulty occurs here; for by the time the elective franchise is conferred, he becomes sufficiently informed to exercise it intelligently and appropriately. All here works well in practice. Men prove themselves adequate judges of what lies immediately around them, but very inadequate to judge of what is situated remotely from them. Republics will succeed if sufficiently limited in territorial extent. Salvation comes to our union, if it comes at all, from observing and respecting State limits.

Northern men claim that they are citizens of the United States. If this be true, we are ruined. The best proof of this is the acts which they perform in exercise of this high immunity. They do little else than demonstrate their incompetency for exercising intelligently such a function. If therefore this function exists, all is lost.

But we deny its existence, and pare down, and limit, by the exact lines of State demarcation, all political and moral rights and responsibilities. We deny that a citizen of one State has any political or moral rights or obligations in another State, which he can exercise or discharge out of that State. And this solves the mystery, why the South takes no notice of the moral efforts which are made at the North about slavery. They plead an absence of jurisdiction; they stand on their reserved rights; they take their own matters into their own hands; they respect themselves. They reply not, because to reply would be admitting that the productions of the North had some claim to notice, which they deny. The profound ignorance of the North, on the subject of slavery, has no claim to enlightenment, in answer to its impertinent assumptions that it knows more about our duties and responsibilities than we do ourselves.

Was there ever such a fallacy as when the North, because their assaults upon the South are unanswered, suppose that therefore they are unanswerable? and that we are labouring under the conviction of the truth and justice of their doctrines? The question of the becomingness of such addresses, lies at the very vitals of the question of the duration of our Union. A people convinced that another people situated remote from them, and in a clime and condition entirely diverse from their own, know more about their concerns than they do themselves?

Could the moral North but be informed of the state of the Southern mind on this subject, I am convinced that the discussion of slavery would nearly cease among decent people at the North; not indeed out of any respect which they have for the people of the South, but from respect which they have for themselves, and for ascertained and defined truth.

Could the North understand what the South think of their moral productions on the subject of slavery, while they answer them not, they would feel any thing but flattered, and would perhaps be convinced that the South had studied manners and politics, and Christianity, and the subject of slavery in all its bearings, to better effect than they had supposed, and would perceive why it is really inexpedient to exercise their right to the freedom of speech and of the press, for the particular benefit of the South.

It is too true to be jested on, that this whole modern discussion at the North about slavery, is *unanswerable*; or at all events, that the South cannot answer it. Could the South but once be induced to retort their moral arguments upon themselves, modest men at the North would not feel disposed to teach the South more on this subject. We have met now, for the

first time, in the history of this world's affairs, an instance of people's saying, "With our tongue will we prevail; we are they that ought to speak: who is lord over us?" Nor is this the first time that it has been proposed to "pull out a mote out of a brother's eye, while a beam is in one's own eye." They would "surely say unto" the North "this proverb—physician, heal thyself."

The right to be without a National Religion, to be of any, and what moral faith we please, or none at all, if we prefer it, was one of the great principles contended for and achieved by the Revolutionary war.—How then can men fail to perceive, that the South are omnipotent in the silence which they observe?

The Bible, which the North have taken into their mouths, furnishes a moral curb for the freedom of speech, so severe, that if the South would so far "condemn themselves in that thing which they allow," as to lay hold on the reins, no great strength would be required to wrench off the nether jaw, tongue and all.

But the North have the same right to be too moral to hold slaves as we have to be just moral enough to do so.

The only alliance which exists between the North and the South, is the alliance of State. The only attitude therefore, that the South can appropriately present to the North, is the attitude of State.

Suppose a citizen of the monarchy of Great Britain, never before out of England, to arrive in Boston, the Capital of the Republic of Massachusetts; suppose himself and a native born citizen of that Republic, both being upwards of twenty-one years of age, to agree as personal friends, to start together for the Republic of Virginia, with a view of settling in that State, if on experience they find it to their advantage to do so. They go thither, have good success, become permanent, valuable, and valued citizens. What "privilege or immunity" has the one had, which the other has not equally enjoyed? None whatever, that I can perceive, except that by the courtesy of the sovereign Republic of Virginia, (I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, which could enforce it, nothing but legislative pleasure alone in sovereign Virginia,) the citizen of the sister Republic is admitted to all the franchises of citizenship, after the expiration of one year, while the other, in consequence of the same sovereign pleasure of Virginia and all the other Republics in the Union combining by their sovereign will, as embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and the laws enacted by the Congress pursuant thereto, waits a much longer time, before he is invested with these franchises.

That Virginia has not the sovereign power to enact that the republican of Massachusetts shall wait, as long as the monarchist of Great Britain shall wait, I have yet to learn. And if there is any contrariety between her doing so, and the Constitution of the United States, where is the remedy? Is not that unwritten law, that this country is an asylum for the emigrant of all lands, which is deeply engrained into the spirit of this nation, as strong a guaranty to the Englishman, in the supposed case, as is the Constitution of the United States, or any thing found therein, to the republican of Massachusetts.

If then, Virginia is sovereign, and uncontrollably so, except by actual subjugation, is it not about equally wise, if not more expedient, for the citizens of Massachusetts, in Massachusetts, on the ground of political and moral right and obligation, to urge on the subjects of Great Britain, who remain at home in Great Britain, the duty of doing away with their religious establishment, and any and all of their institutions which differ from those of Massachusetts, as to urge on Virginians the duty of changing their

individual and State policy? Indeed, might not the functionaries of government in Massachusetts, with great propriety, address friendly letters of advice and remonstrance both to Victoria and Louis Philippe, recommending them both to abdicate their thrones, and thus immediately abandon the sin of monarchical Governments?

It appears to me that in Virginia, the citizen of Great Britain has stronger guarantees than the citizen of Massachusetts, for "privileges and immunities," under the protection of Great Britain. For she holds him a citizen to the end of his days, and his children after him, shall be deemed citizens, and shall enjoy "privileges and immunities" on British soil, to which foreigners are not entitled.

"Is the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus," available to the citizens of Massachusetts in Virginia? and does not the Englishman in Virginia enjoy the same? The Constitution, implying its pre-existence, merely says of that great writ, that it "shall not be suspended," except, so as excepted. It is no more available to the citizens of some one of the States of our Union, in every other State and Territory, of our Union, than it is to all other civilized men, in every State and Territory of our Union.

If then no franchise enures from the Constitution to the citizens of the several States of our Union in the several States of which they are not citizens, is not the idea of a citizen of the United States, a sheer delusion? Is not this idea wholly relative to foreign Governments? and must not we, in order appropriately to term ourselves American citizens or citizens of the United States, go out of the Union.

If we of the Southern slaveholding Republics ought therefore, as a distinguished Northern moralist thinks we ought, to "invite the freest possible discussion of it, (domestic slavery) from what quarter soever it may proceed," (the generalization is admirable, and is consistent,) no reason appears, why this invitation should not be extended to Old England, as well as to New-England. And I see not how Old-England could avoid reciprocating the compliment and invite us to help her discuss her affairs.

Sir, we believe that there is "a limit to human responsibility," and that, UNTIL INVITED, the citizens of one Christian civilized State, are under no moral or political obligation, to trouble themselves about the concerns of civilized Christian States, in distant climes. And "If thou seest the oppression of the poor, and violent perverting of judgment and justice in a Province, marvel not at the matter: for he that is higher than the highest regardeth: and there be higher than they." In mercy to our infirmities, and to our absolute inability to rule the whole earth ourselves, we are told that the Most High God, will attend to those matters of oppression, which we cannot attend to ourselves. And I doubt not, He will one day make it appear, that he governs the world better than is supposed, and that they who in one clime, supervise the affairs of their Christian brethren in other climes, "which say, stand by thyself, come not near me; for I am holier than thou;" "are a smoke in his nose, a *fire that burneth* all the day."

Sir, if the States are sovereign, I submit that they ought so to be respected; and that this distinction should be kept prominently in view, none the less, but the rather, because the locomotive, and the magnetic telegraph transgress the lines of State demarkation with such contemptuous swiftness:—none the less, but rather, because we are increasing, and, I trust, are destined to increase, till, as our States severally equal the States of Europe in territorial extent, so they may yet equal them in population, wealth, and every trait of National greatness.

I have the honor to remain, your friend and fellow patriot,

A NORTHERN MAN WITH SOUTHERN CITIZENSHIP.



